

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated November 8, 2007. Claims 12-29 are currently pending. Claims 12, 16, 18-19, 21-22, 25-27, and 29 have been amended. Claims 12 and 22 are in independent form. No new matter has been added by these amendments. Please charge deposit account 02-1818 for all fees due in connection with this Response.

The specification was objected to because the abstract of the disclosure did not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). Accordingly, the abstract of the disclosure has been presented on a separate page, apart from any other text. Applicant submits the objectionable matter has been addressed. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly requested.

The Office Action rejected independent claims 12 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over D'hoore in view of Riis. Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and traverses such rejection.

The Office Action has conceded that D'hoore fails to teach or suggest the elements of: "determining N second phoneme sequences corresponding to N second pronunciation variants from said phoneme map for each word; and processing said N second phoneme sequences with the phoneme set associated with the language specified as a mother tongue to identify matching or similar words." However, the Office Action states that Riis teaches "capturing both inter- and intra-language pronunciation variations which is ideal for multilingual speaker independent speech recognition systems; generating pronunciations in response to said sequences of multilingual phoneme symbols, and comparing said pronunciations with the acoustic input in order to find a match (Abstract, lines 7 – 10; paragraph 15, lines 8 – 11)."

The citation discloses using multilingual phoneme symbols to recognize both inter- and intra-language pronunciation variations. However, the citation referenced does not disclose "processing said N second phoneme sequences with the phoneme set associated with the language specified as the mother tongue to identify at least one of a matching word and a similar word" as recited in claim 12. Further, the citation referenced does not disclose "creating a language recognizable vocabulary with the N

second phoneme sequences for each word ... for the mother tongue language recognizer" as recited in claim 22. Therefore, D'hoore in view of Riis does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 12 and 22 as currently claimed.

All of the other pending claims depend from independent claims 12 and 22, and the Office Action relies on D'hoors in view of Riis as the basis of rejection for all of the currently pending rejected claims. In light of the limitations of independent claims 12 and 22, and for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully traverses such rejections.


For all the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that all of the claims are novel, non-obvious, and patentably distinguished over the art of record and in condition for allowance. An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance, and in the absence of more pertinent art such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



James F. Goedken
Reg. No. 44,715
Customer No. 29177

Dated: February 8, 2008